

Serial No.: 09/904,965
Docket No.: 40655.2200

REMARKS

Applicants reply to the Final Office Action dated February 14, 2006 within two-months. Thus, Applicants request an Advisory Action, if necessary. Claims 1-6, 8, 10, and 17-22 were pending in the application and the Examiner rejects claims 1-6, 8, 10, and 17-22. Support for the amendments may be found in the originally-filed specification, claims, and figures. No new matter has been introduced by these amendments. Applicants assert that the application is in condition for allowance and reconsideration of the pending claims is requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner rejects claims 3-4 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Udelhoven et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0077871 ("Udelhoven"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

In the "Response to Arguments" section, the Examiner has stated in reference to claim 3 that the Applicants' use of "Passenger Name Record data" means, "determining the fee is based on at least some data which is in the PNR, and without necessarily directly referencing the PNR" (page 7, paragraph 3). Applicants respectfully disagree. Those of ordinary skill would appreciate that a PNR is a database record containing data. However, to expedite prosecution, Applicants have amended claim 3 to clarify that the fee is in-part determined by the Passenger Name Record. In light of this amendment to claim 3, Applicants request Examiner to consider the previously filed arguments.

The Examiner asserts that Udelhoven discloses "receiving travel reservations, comprising passenger name record data from a CRS (see e.g., Fig 2, Fig. 6S), reservations data facilitating charging a fee; obtaining a user profile; charging an account for a travel cost; determining a fee based on the travel reservations data (e.g., that only airline reservations were selected as in Fig. 6V) and the user profile (e.g., credit card number, name to be charged); charging the fee" (Page 2, last paragraph). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Udelhoven is limited to disclosing a Graphical User Interface (GUI) that "is capable of interfacing with multiple air, car and hotel reservation systems." (See Abstract) The disclosed Udelhoven system also maintains traveler profiles with traveler's preferences and preferred payment information. Id. Udelhoven only briefly discloses systems surrounding the GUI interface in order to provide context for the operations of the Udelhoven reservation system. Systems such as Financial and Accounting Systems 208 are only briefly discussed in Udelhoven. (See paragraph 37)

The only substantive information disclosed about billing is the very general disclosure of "[f]inancial systems 208 can receive invoice and account data used to bill travel clients for services

Serial No.: 09/904,965
Docket No.: 40655.2200

and tickets provided by the travel service supplier.” The only other discussion of billing methods in Udelhoven involves a few sentences stating that a traveler profile might contain information containing a list of the traveler’s credit cards and card numbers and which one to charge for air, car, and hotel reservations. (See paragraph 95) However, this disclosure merely includes selecting which card to bill for a type of reservation. Udelhoven discloses a “payment wrap-up window” where the “fare may be split between two or more payment methods.” *Id.* Nothing further is disclosed about how payment for one flight could be split between two credit cards. Paragraph 101 states that a “service fee wrap-up window” is used to provide a mechanism for a travel counselor to add a service fee to a selected fare. Nothing further is disclosed about how such a service fee is to be billed or reconciled.

Moreover, a text search of the Udelhoven reference could not find the words “Passenger Name Record” in the disclosure or any equivalent statement. Significantly, the Examiner has still not pointed out his basis for stating that Udelhoven discloses passenger name record data. Udelhoven does not disclose more than standard flight booking and billing processes. Udelhoven does not disclose anything about the process employed to make a payment for the purchased flight, beyond the fact that payment may eventually be made using a credit card listed in the user’s profile. (See, e.g., paragraph 95) Applicants note that a Passenger Name Record is not even created until a flight is reserved, and, as explained above, Udelhoven does not venture into any substantive discussion of the post-flight reservation processes. If the Examiner still believes that a Passenger Name Record is disclosed in Udelhoven, Applicants again respectfully request that the Examiner cite the Udelhoven paragraph numbers disclosing “determining said fee based upon a Passenger Name Record,” as recited by independent claim 3. Applicants note that even though a CRS system may work with PNR’s, Udelhoven does not disclose use of PNR’s to determine a fee.

Moreover, Udelhoven discloses that a travel agent may use the Udelhoven system to book a flight for a customer and, in some cases; the travel agent may wish to charge a fee for that service. (See, paragraph 101) However, Udelhoven does not disclose or suggest determining the fee itself, or doing so based on a user profile, or doing so based on both a user profile and the PNR. As such, Udelhoven does not disclose or suggest at least, “determining said fee based upon said Passenger Name Record and said user profile, wherein said fee represents an extra charge related to said travel-related transaction in addition to said cost” as recited in independent claim 3.

Serial No.: 09/904,965
Docket No.: 40655.2200

Claim 4 depends from independent claim 3, therefore claim 4 is differentiated from the cited reference for at least the same reasons as set forth above, as well as in view of its own respective features.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejects claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 8, 10-14, 16, 18-25, 27 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Udelhoven. Applicants note that claims 11-14, 16, 23-25, 27, and 28 were canceled in an Amendment and Reply filed on November 23, 2005. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection to pending claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 8, 10, and 18-22.

The Examiner asserts that Udelhoven discloses "receiving travel reservations data from a CRS, reservations data facilitating charging a fee; obtaining a user profile; charging an account for a travel cost; determining a fee based on travel reservation data (e.g., that only airline reservations were selected as in 6V) and the user profile (e.g., credit card number, name to be charged); charging the fee; and providing a billing statement" (page 3, last paragraph). Although the Examiner acknowledges that Udelhoven does not disclose "that the billing statement shows the travel cost, separately shows the fee, and recites indicia indication (sic) that they are related," the Examiner asserts that such is well known in the art. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

As argued above in reference to claim 3, Udelhoven does not disclose or suggest determining the fee itself, or doing so based on a user profile, or doing so based on both a user profile and the PNR. As such, Udelhoven does not disclose or suggest at least, "receiving a Passenger Name Record from a travel reservation system, related to said travel-related transaction, wherein said Passenger Name Record facilitates charging a fee" as recited by independent claim 1.

Claims 2, 5, 6, 8, 10, and 18-22 variously depend from independent claim 1, therefore claims 2, 5, 6, 8, 10, and 18-22 are differentiated from the cited references for at least the same reasons as set forth above, as well as in view of their own respective features.

The Examiner rejects claim 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) or alternatively under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Udelhoven. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

The Examiner asserts that Udelhoven discloses a travel reservations system, "comprising passenger name record data from an accounting system; obtaining a user profile; comparing the PNR data to information in the user profile to determine a fee charged (since the system must compare the PNR data with the profile data in order to determine what card to charge); charging the fee to an account associated with the user profile" (page 6, paragraph 5). However, as argued above in reference to independent claim 3, Udelhoven does not disclose or suggest at least, "receiving a

Serial No.: 09/904,965
Docket No.: 40655.2200

Passenger Name Record from an accounting system, said accounting system configured to receive said Passenger Name Record from a Computer Reservation System", as recited in independent claim 17.

Claims 20-22 variously depend from independent claim 17, therefore claims 20-22 are differentiated from the cited reference for at least the same reasons as set forth above, as well as in view of their own respective features.

Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. No new matter is added in this Reply. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees which may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-2814. Applicants invite the Office to telephone the undersigned if the Examiner has any questions regarding this Reply or the present application in general.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: April 14, 2006

By: Howard A. Sobelman 57,413
Howard Sobelman
Reg. No. 39,038

SNELL & WILMER L.L.P.
400 E. Van Buren
One Arizona Center
Phoenix, Arizona 85004
Phone: 602-382-6228
Fax: 602-382-6070
Email: hsobelman@swlaw.com